

Expected Topics for Steering Committee Votes on 3/17/06

1. Revise the implementation of Good Neighbor Guidelines regarding **private views**?

Background: The Update Package includes a proposed draft required Finding #6: “The project generally complies with applicable privacy, landscaping, noise, lighting and **private view** Good Neighbor Guidelines.” (bold, italics added).

Staff recommends the Steering Committee make the following motions:

- A. Change required NPO Finding #6 to: “The project generally complies with applicable privacy, landscaping, noise, and lighting Good Neighbor Guidelines.”
- B. Keep private view SFDG text and graphics on pages 53 – 58 regarding private views in the SFDG to provide helpful information to the public. The topic would be allowed to be discussed at ABR, but applicants would not be required to project private views in most cases.
- C. Include this additional introductory language on page 46 of the Good Neighbor Guidelines per Steering Committee #15 notes:
“It is the intent of these guidelines to advance sound planning in building homes and additions with scrutiny of neighborhood compatibility, views and privacy. While it is not the intent to create a right to view or a right to privacy, a compromise that advances these goals is highly desirable.”
- D. For projects proposing more than 100% of a recommended maximum FAR, require an additional finding: The project generally allows for comparable private views from the project site and neighboring properties; or, if the project substantially blocks private views of neighbor so that comparable views would not be available to both properties, then:
 - The ABR has visited the site; and
 - There is no suitable alternative design that equally effectively responds to environmental and site constraints as the proposed project; and
 - A super-majority of the ABR supports the project

2. Should **Special Circumstance approval of FARs beyond 100% of the Maximum FAR** be allowed via a PC modification?

Staff recommends the Steering Committee make the following motion:

- E. Include Option 3 for PC modification Special Consideration beyond 100% of Maximum FAR as outlined in the Municipal Code Changes

memo in the Draft Update Package. However, require ABR site visits for these projects and include the required finding listed in recommended Motion D.

3. Should there be a special provision for homes which would become **legal non-conforming as to FAR** when the update occurs?

Staff recommends the Steering Committee make the following motion:

- F. Allow additional 100 square feet square footage beyond existing size for homes which would become non-conforming as to FAR without a PC modification hearing. This would allow flexibility for homeowners needing to make a simple small change such as a bathroom, closet or laundry room addition.

4. Change **name** to Neighborhood Protection Ordinance or Neighborhood Compatibility Ordinance?

Staff recommends the Steering Committee make the following motion:

- G. Change the name of the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance to the Neighborhood Protection Ordinance to keep the “NPO” acronym, but avoid confusion with historic preservation.

5. Include NPO Update **review or sunset date**?

Staff recommends the Steering Committee make the following motion:

- H. Recommend an NPO/SFDG review focused on FARs in 5 years.

6. Keep **one-story regulation trigger for Design Review** at 4,000 square feet as proposed in Draft Update Package?

Staff recommends the Steering Committee make the following motion:

- I. Change the draft Update Package one-story trigger for Design Review in Infill areas to require Design Review for proposals over 85% of the maximum FAR, rather than over 4,000 square feet. Include green building requirement for these projects related to site permeability.

7. Should the figures in the FAR table be based on **net or gross** figures?

Staff recommends the Steering Committee make the following motion:

- J. Use “net” figures to avoid additional calculation and submittal requirements for applicants, even though it has resulted in approximately 10% more flexibility in the chart than was previously

proposed by the Steering Committee. Update FAR chart to clarify that the numbers are “net” numbers.

8. Recommend **flexible parking** of some sort? (If time, discuss further)

Staff Recommendation: Defer tandem parking discussion to planned Transportation Department discussions.

Staff recommends the Steering Committee make the following motion:

- K. Recommend 2 options presented in Municipal Code suggested changes memo be included in the Draft Update Package and forwarded to other hearing bodies for review, especially allowance of one uncovered and one covered space in some circumstances. Allowing one uncovered space could allow a homeowner to gain 200 square feet of living space within FAR limitations.

9. **Forward the overall Draft SFDG/NPO Update Package** to other hearing bodies for review and adoption?

Staff recommends the Steering Committee make the following motion:

- L. The Steering Committee recommends the draft Update Package, including the draft updated Single Family Design Guidelines, Architectural Board of Review Guidelines and Municipal Code Suggested changes, be forwarded to other hearing bodies for review and adoption once March 17th Steering Committee discussion results and any subsequent Steering Subcommittee meeting discussions have been included in the Update Package.